

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-18, 21-22, and 26-29 are currently pending. In the present Request for Reconsideration, none of the claims are amended.

In the March 18, 2010 Office Action, Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14, 17-18, 21-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Muratani (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0023913, now U.S. Patent No. 7,099,493) in view of Cox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,027, hereinafter “Cox”). Claims 5, 15, and 26-29 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Advisory Action of July 22, 2010 maintained the rejections of the March 18, 2010 Office Action.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in the March 18, 2010 Office Action. However, because Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 11, 17, and 21, from which dependent Claims 5, 15 and 26-29 depend, respectively, include allowable subject matter, Claims 5, 15 and 26-29 are maintained in dependent form at the present time.

Also, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Hoang in granting an interview in this case with Applicants’ representatives on August 16, 2010, during which time the issues in the outstanding Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized hereinafter and also on the Interview Summary Sheet. During the interview, it was agreed that Cox fails to teach or suggest the detector and correlator operable to generate a dependant correlation value at each iteration recited by independent Claim 1.

Applicants again note that Muratani’s U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0023913, that was used in the last Office Action, is not prior art against the present application, but only the parent application is, U.S. Patent No. 6,983,059 and the

corresponding U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116618 that was published on August 22, 2002. In the following remarks, Applicants will refer to this earlier publication, in a spirit of moving the prosecution of this case forward. Applicants also respectfully request correction of this formal issue.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14, 17-18, 21-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Muratani in view of Cox, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14, 17-18, 21-22 and 24 recite features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

In regard to independent Claim 1, as explained during the interview, Cox fails to teach or suggest the claimed detector and “***each time the information quantity of the partial code word is increased, the correlator is operable to generate a dependant correlation value*** by correlating the partial code word having increased information quantity with a corresponding partial code word, ***the iterative increasing of the information quantity of the partial codeword continuing until*** the whole code word is recovered by the recovery processor, and correlated with the whole stored code word by the correlator, or ***the predetermined threshold exceeded.***”

Page 2 of the Advisory Action asserts that column 9 of Cox describes the above features. Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 9, lines 21 to 33 describes:

Watermark detection begins by first extracting the PN noise sequence from each 8x8 block using Equation 1. For each block, the PN sequence is then cyclically shifted in the opposite direction by one frequency coefficient, and the average over all the blocks is then computed. In practice, this process can be computed incrementally and does not require temporary storage of all the watermarks. A weighted averaging can also be applied, where the weights are determined based on their susceptibility to common signal transformations such as low pass filtering. ***Finally, the average watermark is compared with the original PN sequence via correlation.***

Thus, this portion of Cox only describes an incremental calculation of all the blocks and a single correlation at the end. It is respectfully submitted that Cox fails to teach or suggest an iterative process where “each time the information quantity of the partial code word is increased, the correlator is operable to generate a dependant correlation value,” as recited by Claim 1.

Independent Claims 11, 17, and 21 recite features similar to those of independent Claim 1. Thus, Cox also fails to teach or suggest the features of independent Claims 11, 17, and 21.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 11, 17, and 21, and all claims depending thereon, patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 10-14, 17-18, 21-22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present Request for Reconsideration, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-18, 21-22, and 26-29 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Derek P. Benke
Registration No. 56,994